



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 29, 2005

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2005-05762

Dear Ms. Alexander:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 227110.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information relating to a specific traffic accident. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). In this instance, the submitted information consists of a completed accident report. Unless the completed report is expressly confidential under other

law or excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code, it must be released to the requestor. Sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary and, as such, do not constitute other law that makes information confidential. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App. – Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under Gov't Code § 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103 subject to waiver), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.111 subject to waiver). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code.

The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure constitute “other law” for purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). This office has determined that when the work product privilege is claimed for information that is subject to release under section 552.022, the proper analysis is whether the information at issue is protected under Texas Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 (work product). Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 5-6 (2002), 677 at 8-9 (2002). Accordingly, we will address your work product privilege arguments under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

You claim that the information subject to section 552.022 is protected under the attorney work product privilege. For the purpose of section 552.022(a), information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and 2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *Id.* The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204. The second prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contain the attorney's

or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You contend that the section 552.022 information constitutes attorney work product. You state that these documents were prepared by the department's attorneys or their representatives in anticipation of litigation, and that these documents contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or attorney's representative. After reviewing the submitted information and considering your arguments, we conclude that the exhibit consists of purely factual information that does not reveal an attorney's mental processes, conclusions, strategies, or legal theories. *See generally Leede Oil & Gas, Inc. v. McCorkle*, 789 S.W.2d 686 (Tex. App.—Houston [1<sup>st</sup> Dist.] 1990, no writ) (stating that privilege does not protect memoranda prepared by attorney that contain only "neutral recital" of facts). Accordingly, the submitted information does not constitute core work product and must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "L. Joseph James".

L. Joseph James  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 227110

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steven N. Walden  
The Carlson Law Firm  
3833 Texas Avenue, Suite 280  
Bryan, Texas 77802  
(w/o enclosures)